

### REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are pending. Claim 22 is allowed. Claims 1, 3, 4, 9, 10, 14, 17, 18, 20, and 21 are objected to. Claims 23 and 24 have been added. Claims 1, 3, 9, 11, and 18 have been amended within the subject matter of the application as filed. Claim 17 has been cancelled without prejudice. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1, 2, 5-8, 11-13, 15-16, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,078,468 of Fiske in view of the alleged knowledge in the art.

### Claim Objections

The Examiner has objected to claim 1. Claim 1 has been amended appropriately. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 as amended overcomes the Examiner's objection and should be allowed.

### Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected 1, 2, 5-8, 11-13, 15-16, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fiske in view of alleged knowledge in the art. In regard to the rejection of claims 1, 2, 5-8, 11-13, 15-16, and 19, applicants respectfully submit that they are not obvious in view of the combination of Fiske and the alleged knowledge in the art.

Such combination lacks one or more features of the rejected claims. In regard to the rejection of claim 1, claim 1 recites the feature of "an optical recording system...wherein the writing array and reading array are embedded in a substrate" (claim 1) (emphasis added).

The Examiner states that "none of the prior art of record discloses the combined claimed features of related to an optical recording system, which comprises a writing array of VCSELs and a separate reading array of VCSELs, both of which are embedded in a common substrate, . . ."

(Office Action, November 6, 2002, p.4) Fiske does not disclose the writing array and reading array are embedded in a substrate. (claim 1)

Because the combination of Fiske and the alleged knowledge does not disclose this feature as taught by applicant and given that claims 2-10 depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 1 and add additional limitations, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-10 are not patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Fiske in view of the alleged knowledge in the art.

In regard to the rejection of claim 11, a combination of Fiske and the alleged knowledge would lack one or more features of claim 11. Amended claim 11 discloses the feature of “an optical recording system wherein the first VCSEL array is located on a first substrate, and the second VCSEL array is located on a second substrate.” (claim 11) This feature is substantially similar to a feature of cancelled claim 17 which the Examiner stated would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Thus, a combination of Fiske, and the alleged knowledge in the art, would lack this feature. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 11-21 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) by Fiske in view of the alleged knowledge in the art.

Applicants respectfully submit that all rejections have been overcome. Consideration of this amendment should lead to favorable action that would overcome all remaining grounds of objection and/or rejection.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: May 5, 2003

Sanjeet K. Dutta  
Sanjeet K. Dutta  
Reg. No. 46,145

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026  
(408) 947-8200